I’m so excited to be serving you this year! LIRT has long been my professional home, and I hope you find that LIRT contributes meaningfully to your growth as a librarian.

LIRT had a fantastic Annual Meeting, and I wanted to note some highlights from the conference. The Conference Program Committee hosted a standing-room-only program on mindfulness. After an opening meditation led by Ven. Sagarananda Tien, three librarians—Amy Laughlin of Ferguson Library (Stamford, CT), Zaiga Alksnitis of Middlesex School (Concord, MA), and Jill Luedke of Temple University—described how mindfulness improves their teaching. Laughlin incorporates centering activities into storytimes. Alksnitis’s school incorporated mindfulness into its curriculum. Luedke uses contemplative activities in her one-shot sessions. All ALA members should have access to the recording of this timely program at this link.

We also had an impressively well-attended All Membership Meeting at Annual. In previous years, this had been a meeting only of the individual LIRT committees. But this year (now-Past President) Kristen Edson changed its name and format, to be open to all LIRT members. (There are over 1,700 of us; when else do we have the chance to get together?!) The turnout was incredible, and many LIRT members found new ways to get involved that day. Thank you to Kristen for making this huge improvement!

Other highlights from Annual include a social hosted by the Transitions Committee, Membership’s BITES with LIRT lunch, the Adult Learners Committee’s sold-out Friday preconference, and the Awards Ceremony, where LIRT honored Dickinson College with the Innovation in Instruction Award and...
From the President

Prof. Clarence Maybee of Purdue University with the Librarian Recognition Award. You can read more about all of these highlights in the committee chairs’ reports and ALA Annual 2019 in Review in the pages that follow. Many thanks to the committee chairs and volunteers who brought this work to fruition!

In the 2019-2020 business year, LIRT will continue its work of empowering librarians to become better teachers. We’ll keep up all our usual activities: a Midwinter discussion forum, the Top 20 articles list, newsletters, webinars, a program at Annual. But there are some unique things happening this year that you should be aware of!

First, a new LIRT committee was formed as of July 1. The former Web Advisory Committee and the Newsletter Committee have merged to form the Communications Committee. This merger came after years of discussion by the LIRT Steering Committee, particularly after its most recent retreat in 2015. Having a single committee that’s in charge of soliciting and distributing information about LIRT will lead to more consistency in how our roundtable communicates, both with LIRT’s members and with the greater library community. Many thanks to chairs Billie Peterson-Lugo and Sherri Brown for leading this fledgling committee this year!

Second, ALA is going through an organizational review, which eventually will impact how LIRT operates. Since June 2018, the Steering Committee on Organizational Effectiveness (SCOE) has been reviewing ALA’s governance, structures, processes, etc. with the aim of making final recommendations about how to redesign ALA to be more effective. They presented some preliminary recommendations earlier this year and should have final recommendations for Council to vote on in 2019-2020. Please see Maria McCauley’s piece about the SCOE organizational review on page 10.

Lastly, next June, the LIRT Steering Committee will meet for its next 5-year retreat to discuss what LIRT is doing well and otherwise. In the coming 11 months, if you have questions, concerns, or suggestions related to how LIRT functions as a roundtable and how it could better meet your needs, please feel free to send them to me or to the other LIRT officers.

Best of luck in this back-to-school season, in libraries of all types!

—Mark

From the Past President

It is hard to believe that another year has passed, and I will now be serving as LIRT’s Past President. The support and guidance I have received over the last year is greatly appreciated. I have grown as a leader and a professional through the experience I have gained on the LIRT Executive Board. This next year will have new lessons to teach me, I am sure. The hard work and innovation of our Steering, Executive, and all committee members has been outstanding this year; from the bottom of my heart I want to thank you!

I know that our leadership will continue their commitment to the mission, vision, and values of LIRT. Mark Robison will take the office of President with just enough seriousness and humor to bring balance to his tenure. Under his leadership, our cooperative projects will continue to make our roundtable a success, garnering respect from our fellow colleagues. Expanding our offerings and benefits to LIRT membership at large is a priority, and I hope that through these we will continue to grow our membership base. Included in the infographic on page 3 are just some of the highlights from the last year’s ALA conferences and membership statistics:

Kristen Edson, LIRT Past President
It has been a wonderful experience serving as the President, and I look forward to the next stage of my service through Annual 2020. As part of my responsibilities, the organization and planning committee and I, with input from Steering and Executive Boards, will be planning our next LIRT retreat at Annual 2020 in Chicago. Together we will draw on the experiences and data from the last five years to inform where LIRT will head next.

I encourage everyone to start considering now the opportunity to serve in a higher capacity to LIRT. It is a wonderful and rewarding experience that you will not regret. If you have any interest or want to ask questions on what the commitment would be like on the Executive Board, please reach out to me personally at kedson@brla.gov or 225-231-3702.

Kristen
From the Editor

This year’s ALA Annual was one of my favorites. In addition to many LIRT-related activities, my favorite event of the conference was visiting the Library of Congress (see my picture, at left, with Librarian of Congress Dr. Carla Hayden!). This was my first trip to Washington, D.C., and I was able to take some time to walk along the National Mall and explore the National Portrait Gallery and Smithsonian American Art Museum when I wasn’t in meetings or sessions. The heat broke just in time for the conference as well, which was certainly refreshing. In the pages that follow, you can see highlights from some of LIRT’s activities at Annual, read more about what we’ve accomplished over the past year, and get a sense of where we’re heading (and who’s leading the way)!

Enjoy,

Sherri

Librarian of Congress Dr. Carla Hayden and Sherri Brown, LIRT News Editor
Member A-LIRT
Tressa Snyder
Reference & Instruction Librarian
Langenheim Memorial Library, Thiel College

What brought you to LIRT?
I joined LIRT because my primary responsibility is creating and teaching library instruction curriculum and programming.

What was your path to librarianship?
I have an undergraduate background in Environmental Studies, Geography and Geology and a Master’s in Library Science. I have experience working in academic and public libraries, serving many positions including director. College students are my “people.” I love helping students achieve goals and realize their potential. My unique background knowledge in the sciences and my love of students and life-long learning led me to librarianship.

Tell us about your current position. What do you like most about it?
For the past 12 years, I have served as the Reference & Instruction Librarian at Thiel College in Greenville, Pennsylvania. We are a small, liberal arts college. I teach library instruction classes and work closely with faculty to tailor the sessions to the needs of the class and assignments. I can be creative with students and never have to treat them like a number. Students are able to shine in this environment. My greatest joy is seeing students come in as freshmen, do some library research, figure out life, become stellar young adults and then go on to the workforce or graduate school. Watching students learn and grow through an excellent liberal arts education is amazing and magical to me. I am honored to be a small part of their educational experience. I also work with first-year students and teach an environmental themed freshman seminar class and serve as the first year academic advisor for these students.

In what ways does it challenge you?
I wear many hats and fill many roles for students and faculty. I’m constantly working with faculty to improve library instruction and provide quality resources that support the curriculum. Every day is filled with learning and is always fast paced. I would not change a thing.

Throughout all of your educational experiences, what teacher inspired you the most and why?
Dr. Henry Lawrence for being an open-minded environmentalist, Mrs. Oakes for teaching me about travel and being a female leader, and Mr. Ted Atkinson for pushing me to think creatively. Dr. Bernard Vavrek for teaching me about rural libraries.

When you travel, what do you never leave home without?
Healthy snacks and water, because a healthy lifestyle is very important to me.

If you could change one thing about libraries today, what would it be?
For library patrons to understand the importance of life-long reading and learning. Libraries are not dusty buildings. They are full of helpful, friendly librarians who will do anything for patrons. The keys to life, knowledge, and learning are in the library. The library is everything.

Tell us one thing about yourself that most of us probably don’t know.
I am interested in weightlifting and may someday be in body building competitions. I also enjoy attending pole fitness classes with my group of Zumba friends.
Who’s Who in LIRT

LIRT Elected Officers

President:
Mark Robison
Political Science and Peace Studies Librarian,
University of Notre Dame

Vice President/President-Elect:
Jennifer Hunter
Reference and Research Services Librarian,
Princeton University

Immediate Past President:
Kristen Edson
Deputy Library Director,
East Baton Rouge Parish Library, Louisiana

Treasurer:
Mardi Mahaffy
Head of Teaching & Learning,
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Vice Treasurer/Treasurer-Elect:
Ning Zou
Learning Design and Research Librarian,
Harvard Graduate School of Education

Secretary:
Beth Fuchs
Undergraduate Learning Librarian,
University of Kentucky

Archivist:
Cinthya Ippoliti
Auraria Library Director,
University of Colorado Denver

LIRT ALA Councilor:
Victor Baeza
Director of Library Graduate Services,
Oklahoma State University
Who's Who in LIRT

LIRT Committee Leadership 2019-2020

**Adult Learners**
Chair: Michael Saar  
Head, Instruction and Assessment; Instructional Design Librarian, Lamar University  
Vice Chair: Heather Lowe  
Adult Services Administrator, J. Erik Jonsson Central Library, Dallas, Texas

**Awards**
Chair: Joshua Vossler  
Head of Reference & Instruction, Southern Illinois University  
Vice Chair: Emilia Rose Marcyk  
Instructional Technology/Teaching & Learning Librarian, Michigan State University

**Communications Committee**
Chair: Billie Peterson-Lugo  
Associate Professor/Director Digital Library Services and Systems, Baylor University  
Vice Chair: Sherri Brown  
Librarian for English, University of Virginia

**Conference Program Committee 2020**
Chair: Erica England  
First-year Experience Librarian, Washington State University  
Vice Chair: Jennifer Saulnier  
Undergraduate Services Librarian, Washington State University

**Liaison**
Chair: Laura Pearle  
Director, Cox Library  
Milton Academy, Milton, Massachusetts  
Vice Chair: Kristin Strohmeyer  
Research and Outreach Librarian, Hamilton College

**Membership**
Chair: Michael Pearce  
Head, Gorgas Information Services, University of Alabama  
Vice-Chair: Carla James-Jackson  
Senior Director of Academic & Student Services, Roanoke Higher Education Center, Virginia

**Organization and Planning**
Chair: Kristen Edson  
Deputy Library Director, East Baton Rouge Parish Library, Louisiana

**Teaching, Learning, and Technology**
Chair: Fagdeba Adjola Bakoyema  
Business Reference Librarian & Information Literacy and Learning Assistance Coordinator, Alabama State University  
Vice Chair: Leanna Fry Balci  
Instructional Design Librarian, Brigham Young University

**Top 20**
Chair: April Joy Schweikhard  
Scholarly Communications Librarian, Kennesaw State University  
Vice Chair: Ann Marie Smeraldi  
Assistant Director for Public Services, Cleveland State University

**Transitions**
Chair: Holly Jane Luetkenhaus  
First Year Experience Librarian, Oklahoma State University  
Vice Chair: Rebecca Neel  
Reference and Online Learning Librarian, University of Southern Indiana
2018-19 Committee Reports

**Adult Learners:**
The adult learners committee planned and executed the Friday LIRT preconference held at ALA Annual in June. Several new and existing members of the adult learners committee met during the all-membership meeting at ALA Annual. We reflected on the preconference and generally felt it was a successful event. We also discussed the upcoming Midwinter Discussion forum. Several potential topics were suggested. The committee will meet virtually this summer to settle on a topic in time to announce it in official ALA Midwinter programming.

**Awards:**
The awards committee had another successful year soliciting nominations for our awards. We received several new nominations for the Librarian Recognition Award and the Innovation in Instruction Award. Given our practice of keeping previous nominations active for three years, this gave us a large number of nominations to review for the awards. The Award Ceremony and Reception was held at Annual, with brief remarks given by the award winners.

**Conference Program:**
The conference program committee successfully coordinated and hosted the LIRT President’s Panel on Saturday, June 23, 2019. The 2020 conference program proposal on K-12 to college transitions was submitted to the Steering Committee during the annual conference.

**Membership:**
The membership committee met virtually four times over the last year and continued to send welcome, welcome back, and goodbye messages to incoming, returning, and departing members of LIRT. We made sure to distribute LIRT swag at the annual programs, as well as the ribbons for badges. We will continue to coordinate messaging for members and will recommend purchasing new swag prior to Midwinter 2020.

**Newsletter:** The newsletter committee continued to publish *LIRT News* four times during the year, with a September, December, April, and June issue. We also processed and shared data from the 2018 LIRT communications survey that we conducted. At Annual 2019, we spent the time working toward transitioning to the communications committee (something else we had begun work on during the year). Specifically, we laid out plans for creating a LIRT Communications Plan in the coming year.

**Organization and Planning:**
This past year, the organization and planning committee began planning the next LIRT retreat and worked toward updating the LIRT manual. In the coming year, the committee will continue to focus our energy on the 2020 LIRT Retreat planning and execution. We will continue working with the Executive Board on the manual update project, creating a measure update schedule and guideline.

**Top 20:**
During the past year, the top 20 committee completed review of the library instruction literature from 2018 and published the top 20 list in the June 2019 *LIRT News*. The outgoing co-chair created transition documents to aid next year’s co-chair in coordinating the work of the group, which has been shared via Google document. This document will be amended to help chairs and co-chairs into the future of this committee.

**Transitions:**
The committee’s largest project for the year was coordinating the discussion forum at Midwinter, which explored how to improve communication between high school and college librarians. The event was well-attended and sparked conversation among committee members about ways to get more school and public librarians involved, as these conversations often happen from the academic librarian end. The committee also continued work on two other projects. First, the Connecting Librarians for K-20 Transitions map continues to be added to and updated. Second, the group began work on updating the reading list/bibliography for resources related to libraries and information literacy and supporting students in transition. The work on this bibliography will continue with a plan to release the new list next year.
Dear Tech Talk:

A colleague of mine recently mentioned Controlled Digital Lending. What she said seemed interesting, but maybe not entirely viable. I think I need more information.

– Curious Diligent Librarian about Controlled Digital Lending

Dear CDLCDL:

In September 2018, Dave Hansen (Associate University Librarian for Research, Collections and Scholarly Communication, Duke University) and Kyle K. Courtney (Copyright Advisor and Program Manager, Harvard University) announced the release of a position statement and an in-depth white paper introducing an approach and rationale to enable libraries to digitize print books and loan the digital copies in lieu of the print books—formally called Controlled Digital Lending (CDL). (Hansen & Courtney, 2018, Sep 28)

Although CDL may be the first articulation of a viable approach to a challenging issue—digital access to a large corpus of books published in the U.S. in the early to late 20th century, many out of print and many considered orphan works (rights holder cannot be identified or located)—the concept itself is not completely new. Early in their white paper, Hansen & Courtney (2018) stated:

A CDL system is not a brand-new concept. There are multiple versions of CDL-like systems currently being used in libraries. The idea was first explored in the pioneering article “Building a Collaborative Digital Collection: A Necessary Evolution in Libraries” [2011] by Michelle Wu, Professor of Law and Law Library Director at Georgetown University School of Law. Later, the Internet Archive created the “Open Library: Digital Lending Library” project [2010], which has successfully utilized a unique CDL-like system for the past 8 years. Multiple libraries have now harnessed the same CDL system [Open Library] and partnered with Internet Archive to loan their digital copies of books. (pp. 2-3)

In the position statement, Bailey, Courtney, Hansen, Minow, Schultz, & Wu (2018) defined Controlled Digital Lending:

Properly implemented [emphasis mine], CDL enables a library to circulate a digitized title in place of a physical one in a controlled manner. Under this approach, a library may only loan simultaneously the number of copies that it has legitimately acquired, usually through purchase or donations. . . Essentially, CDL must maintain an owned to loaned [emphasis mine] ratio. Circulation in any format is controlled so that only one user can use any given copy at a time, for a limited time. Further, CDL systems generally employ appropriate technical measures to prevent users from retaining a permanent copy or distributing additional copies. (p. 2)

Continued on Page 22
Organizational Effectiveness and Governance Review (SCOE)

By Maria McCauley, ALA Executive Board Member

For a long time now, member feedback has indicated that ALA is not meeting the needs of all of its members because it is too large and too difficult to navigate. This review is an opportunity to create a more efficient organization for future members. At the 2018 Midwinter Meeting in Denver, the Executive Board issued a call to the membership to consider what it would take to align ALA’s organizational structure, policies, and rules with the Association’s mission and its 21st century values, key action areas, and strategic directions—in the context of a significantly changed environment. Preliminary Recommendations include:

- A redesigned ALA Executive Board, the policy-making body of the organization, comprised of seventeen voting members including four officers, eight members elected by the membership, and five selected by the Executive Board for unique skills required to govern the organization.

- Three committees will support the ALA Executive Board: a 15-member Nominating & Leadership Development Committee nominated by the ALA President and elected by the Executive Board; a 15-member Policy & Development Committee elected by Membership; a 15-member Finance and Audit Committee elected by Membership.

- Three Leadership Assemblies: Division, Roundtable, and Chapter will provide an open communication exchange to and from the ALA Executive Board and members. These assemblies will offer input to the ALA Executive Board on critical issues, serve as a forum for integrated planning and prioritization, and share effective practices. Assembly participants will include two elected leaders from the oversight body of the participating groups, the senior staff leader of the group, and a designated ALA liaison from the group represented.

- The Assembly structure is designed to consolidate meetings to create efficiency and streamlined lines of communication to the Executive Board and reduce barriers to communication.

- The Roundtable Leadership Assembly will replace the Roundtable Coordinating Committee and provide more support and structure for the work of that group.

- Volunteer work will be broken down into Advisory Communities, Working groups, and Communities of Practice/Engagement/Interest.

- More structural consistency will be applied to Round Tables in order to enable Round Table leaders and ALA staff to focus less on administrative tasks and more on providing quality programs and resources to its members. For example, ALA Connect will be the official place for all Round Table member engagement activities and Round Table elections may take place in Connect.

The Steering Committee on Organizational Effectiveness (SCOE) team will convene again in early September 2019 to consider feedback from the 2019 Annual Conference as well as financial impact data. SCOE will present recommendations to the ALA Executive Board and seeks to have a full proposal for Council consideration at the 2020 Midwinter Meeting.

LIRT members who want to stay up-to-date on SCOE announcements or start a discussion should consider joining the SCOE Connect space.
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The 2018-2019 Conference Planning Committee successfully held the President's Panel: *How Did I Get Here? Mindfulness in Library Instruction* on Saturday, June 23, 2019. Several committee members were present to greet presenters, greet attendees, hand out programs and evaluations, point attendees toward refreshments, take pictures, and do head counts. Our panel was well-attended by over 120 people, and our evaluations were very positive. In particular, attendees appreciated hearing from librarians from a variety of settings and enjoyed having a mindfulness meditation at the beginning of the session. Overall, it was a very effective and illuminating program that touched on a wide range of library instruction-related topics.
LIRT Preconference

The Adult Learners Committee hosted a preconference at the ALA annual conference entitled *Supporting Lifelong Learning: How Your Library Can Better Serve Adult Learners*. The preconference began with a definition and shared traits of adult learners along with an overview of major adult learner theories. The first session, The Secret Lives of Online Learners, discussed perspectives from both librarians who support digital learning as well as adult learners utilizing digital learning. Session two, Designing Instruction That’s Right for Adults, provided examples of specific lesson plans and activities targeted towards adult learners. The day concluded with the final session, Tremendous! 3 Big Ideas for Marketing Library Service to Adults, where the panelists discussed tactics for engaging adult patrons with successful programming and marketing strategies. The preconference was well-attended, with 75 participants.

Photos by Mark Robison and Bridget Farrell
Bites with LIRT

LIRT members met on Sunday, June 23, for brunch at Espita Mezcaleria in Washington, D.C., while attending ALA Annual. Members enjoyed creative Mexican-inspired cuisine and the great company of librarians from all over the country. Bites with LIRT events are a great way to get to know other LIRT members in a relaxed setting. If you'd like to get more involved with LIRT, or just want to escape the crowd and lunch with some friendly faces, please join us at our next event in Philadelphia!

Transitions Social

Approximately 10 people gathered on Saturday, June 22, at the High Velocity Sports Bar in Washington, D.C., during Annual. The group included LIRT members, presenters from the pre-conference, and others interested in connecting with librarians who work with students in transition. It was a casual, fun opportunity to reconnect with old friends and make new ones.
Awards Ceremony

The sixth annual LIRT Awards Ceremony and Reception was held at the Marriott Marquis in Washington, D.C., on Sunday, June 23. Beth Fuchs, Chair of the 2019 LIRT Awards Committee, began the ceremony with an overview of the awards and an acknowledgement of those who served on the Librarian Recognition Award subcommittee and the Innovation in Instruction Award subcommittee. She then introduced the award honorees: Dr. Clarence Maybee, Associate Professor and Information Literacy Specialist at Purdue University and recipient of the 2019 Librarian Recognition Award; and Christine Bombaro, Associate Director for Information Literacy and Research Services at Waidner-Spahr Library of Dickinson College and recipient of the 2019 Innovation in Instruction Award. The honorees briefly spoke about their passion for information literacy and the achievements that earned them these awards. Honorees and attendees enjoyed light refreshments.
Clockwise from top left: Washington Monument (photo by Sherri Brown), LIRT Executive Committee Meeting, the Library of Congress Main Reading Room (photo by Sherri Brown), LIRT Steering Committee Meeting
Beyond CRAAP: An Updated Approach to Source Evaluation

Report by: Michael Saar, Lamar University

Presenters:
Mary Thill – Humanities Librarian, Northeastern Illinois University
James Rosenzweig – Education Librarian, Eastern Washington University
Frank Lambert – Program Director, Middle Tennessee State University

Date: June 23, 2019

Audience: Academic Librarians

https://research.ewu.edu/beyondcraap

Summary:
The presenters shared the results of their ongoing research in source evaluation and discussed how to employ the model they developed at other institutions. The presentation began with an introduction to the taxonomy they used in their research, a modified version of a taxonomy created by Leeder, Markey, and Yakel. Their use of the taxonomy focused solely on source authority: author, editorial process, and publication purpose. They chose this taxonomy because it offers advantages over more traditional ways of evaluating resources such as the CRAAP method. For one, unlike CRAAP, it is not highly subjective and is easily replicable regardless of who is utilizing the method. Second, because it utilizes coding, it allows librarians to more easily calculate reliability and to draw more meaningful conclusions from the data. Finally, this rubric is a value-neutral tool which is more conducive to working within the ACRL Framework.

The taxonomy itself investigates three areas related to authority. The first looks at the author of a source along six facets (unknown author, layperson, corporate author, professional amateur, applied professional, and academic professional). The second area explores the editorial process along six facets (self-published, vanity press, collaborative editing, moderated submissions, editor and editorial staff, and peer-reviewed). The final area is publication purpose, again analyzed along six facets (personal, commercial, non-profit, K-12 audience, government, and higher education). The value of using these facets together is it allows for a more nuanced examination of source construction in terms of audience, credibility, and purpose.

The presenters then discussed the team’s research project using this rubric to examine student composition papers. The study looked at the references in ten papers randomly selected from three English composition courses each at different universities in the United States. A total of 308 references were classified in this study. The most commonly occurring resources were written by academic
professionals through a peer-review editorial process and intended for higher education readers. One surprising finding was the low usage of government information resources as a reference in these papers. The implications for this study are that no one institution’s students are the same in terms of their perception and construction of authority and that context needs to be considered by instructors and instructional librarians.

The presenters then led attendees through a short exercise to familiarize participants with the taxonomy using sample sources. The presenters noted that a similar exercise of asking students to assign sources to these various facets could be utilized in classroom instruction.

The session concluded with a discussion on how to utilize the taxonomy for assessment. This tool can be utilized even if librarians aren’t able to employ it in the classroom. Librarians can use this rubric to assess student work following information literacy sessions to identify source use patterns and determine if changes to instructional practice are necessary. The tool could also be incorporated into program-level assessment to examine a specific major or degree program, tracing students’ source usage over time or discovering patterns relevant to a specific discipline’s standards for information literacy.

**Biggest Takeaway:**

The rubric described by the presenters offers a value-neutral approach to resource evaluation that doesn't privilege specific types of information (scholarly, peer-reviewed) over others. This method allows for librarians to draw more nuanced conclusions of student source usage than traditional methods of resource evaluation.

**How you might use this information:**

As outlined in the presentation, this rubric could be utilized both as an in-class instruction tool/assignment or as an internal assessment tool at either the class or program level.
Liaison Reports, continued

Librarians as Researchers: Designing & Implementing Scholarship of Teaching & Learning Projects

Report by: Michael Saar, Lamar University

Presenters:
Melissa Mallon - Director of Peabody Library/Director of Teaching and Learning, Vanderbilt University
Lauren Hays - Instructional and Research Librarian, MidAmerica Nazarene University
Rhonda Huisman – Dean, University Library, St. Cloud State University

Date: June 23, 2019

Audience: Academic Librarians

Summary:
The presenters discussed the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) and how it can be utilized by librarians to develop as a research while performing regular work activities. SoTL was characterized as an international movement to study teaching and learning in order to improve student learning. The growth in this practice provides an opportunity for librarians to participate in and develop through SoTL. The presenters feel this is a good research tool for librarians due to its focus on the local context. Librarians teach in many ways at the reference desk, in one-shots, in for-credit classes, but everything done is situated within the context of the librarian’s specific institution. Often educational research is very generalizable and quantitative-based, but SoTL emphasizes what is happening in individual classrooms (and even classes) to investigate what is happening with student learning and to share that information publicly. The benefits of librarians utilizing SoTL include putting a stronger emphasis on teaching culture in librarian practice, analyzing librarians’ instructional impact at local institutions, and creating a larger, professional conversation about the type of teaching librarians do and its impact on student learning.

Next, the presenters discussed the components that contribute to a successful SoTL project. The first step is to consider your local context and how students use information in these contexts. The local context may refer to a librarian’s institution, program, or a specific course or lesson. Investigations of information use should focus on what the librarian is utilizing pedagogically and to teach specific practices and if it is something that can be measured qualitatively or quantitatively. The presenter utilized an example form St. Cloud University. St. Cloud has a six-component information literacy program integrated through the institutional curriculum that covers topics such as critical thinking, civic responsibility, and integrating technology. The librarians teach courses that align with these areas each year.
Next the presenters modeled how to craft information literacy-specific questions for SoTL research. The overall approach is to investigate what the librarian wants to know about how students use or interact with information. Several sample approaches were provided: What if (and is) information literacy is a shared understanding? For who is information literacy most crucial? Is information literacy a continuum, a spectrum, a skill, a tool, or an application? How does information literacy impact interdisciplinary research and application?

Following this, the presenters encouraged researchers to consider what SoTL level to focus on. There are several designated levels in SoTL: the micro or course-level, the meso or department-level; the macro or university-level, and the mega or disciplinary level (national contexts). Considering the level will assist in focusing the research question on a specific perspective or context. After determining the level, consider what concepts or ideas connect to this research (the ACRL frames or other disciplinary standards, for example). Finally, identify other relevant resources, logical stakeholders, collaborative partners in the library, and resources at the institution.

The final segment of the presentation provided tips on designing the research (formulating a question and methodology) and considering IRB requirements. The presenters concluded by emphasizing the importance of sharing research in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Participants discussed and brainstormed a variety of outlets for sharing research including informal discussions on campus (brown-bag workshops), self-published work (podcasts), shared repositories (Project CORA), as well as formalized presentations or publications (conferences and journals).

**Biggest Takeaway:**

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning provides a framework for librarians to reflect on the pedagogical impact of the work they already do in the classroom or at the reference desk in order to improve student learning.

**How you might use this information:**

The process utilizes current librarian practices and simply asks the librarian to apply a structured, reflective perspective through identifying the local context, crafting information literacy-specific questions to research, identifying the level to focus the research, identifying any applicable concepts connecting to the research, targeting other stakeholders, and sharing the research.
2020 LIRT Librarian Recognition Award
Call for Nominations

We are pleased to invite nominations for the 2020 LIRT Librarian Recognition Award. The Librarian Recognition Award is given in acknowledgement of a librarian’s contribution to the development, advancement, and support of information literacy and instruction in any type of library. Self-nominations are welcome.

The award will be judged based on the following:

- Contributions to library literature on topics related to instruction/information literacy. These contributions can consist of both formal and informal publications (peer-reviewed articles and book chapters, blog postings, newsletter contributions, etc.). Non-traditional forms of publishing will be considered.

- Key role in the creation of an instruction/information literacy program or project that has shown potential for wide-spread sharing and replication.

- Impactful participation within local, regional, national, and/or international level professional organizations that are devoted to the support and promotion of library instruction and information literacy in any type of library.

Nomination Materials:
To nominate a librarian for the LIRT Librarian Recognition Award, please submit a nomination packet that includes:

- Completed nomination sheet (available on LIRT Awards website)
- Letter from the nominator addressing the award criteria (see rubric on LIRT Awards website), providing concrete examples
- 3 letters of support
- Resume or CV for the individual being nominated

Other supporting materials that show the individual’s contributions to information literacy and instruction are welcome. Electronic submission of nomination materials is expected. Further information regarding the award and the selection process can be found on the LIRT Awards website: http://www.ala.org/rt/lirt/awards

Deadline

Send all LIRT Librarian Recognition Award nomination materials by January 15, 2020 to:
Joshua Vossler  jvossler@lib.siu.edu

The award winner will be notified following the ALA Midwinter Conference, no later than February 15, 2020.

The award will be presented at the 2020 ALA Annual Conference. Award winners will receive a $1,000 cash award, a plaque, and a $500 travel stipend to be used toward attending the ALA Annual Conference. Awards are sponsored by the Library Instruction Round Table.

If you have any questions, please contact the LIRT Awards Committee Chair, Joshua Vossler (jvossler@lib.siu.edu).
2020 LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award
Call for Nominations

We are pleased to invite nominations for the 2020 LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award. The Innovation in Instruction Award is given in recognition of a library’s contributions to the development, advancement, and support of information literacy and instruction in any type of library. Self-nominations are welcome.

The award will be given to a library that has done one (or more) of the following:

• Revamped its public instruction program in response to a new technology, an assessment report, etc.
• Initiated a public program that utilizes best practices of instruction in combination with new methods of delivery.
• Created an original type of instruction, e.g., team-taught interdisciplinary research sessions, a novel form of outreach, etc.
• Practice(s) will be prioritized over scholarship with preference for innovative practices that are low-cost and can be easily reproduced elsewhere.

Nomination Materials:
To nominate a library for the LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award, please submit a nomination packet that includes the following:

• Completed nomination sheet (available on LIRT Awards website)
• Letter from the nominator addressing the award criteria (see rubric on LIRT Awards website), providing concrete examples
• 3 letters of support

Other supporting materials that show the library’s contributions to information literacy and instruction are encouraged. Only one member of the library nomination group needs to be a librarian. Electronic submission of nomination materials is expected. Further information regarding the award and the selection process can be found on the LIRT Awards website: http://www.ala.org/rt/lirt/awards

Deadline

Send all LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award nomination materials by January 15, 2020 to:
Emilia Marcyk  marcyk@msu.edu

The award winner will be notified following the ALA Midwinter Conference, no later than February 15, 2020.

The award will be presented at the 2020 ALA Annual Conference. Award winners will receive a $1,000 cash award, a plaque, and a $500 travel stipend to be used toward attending the ALA Annual Conference. Awards are sponsored by the Library Instruction Round Table.

If you have any questions, please contact the LIRT Awards Committee Chair, Joshua Vossler (jvossler@lib.siu.edu).
On reading this, your first thought may be: How can this be; isn’t digitizing an entire book and making it available for others blatant copyright infringement? The copyright experts who formalized CDL argue that this is a viable approach using current copyright law, specifically Section 109, which covers the first sale/exhaustion doctrine and Section 107, Fair Use.

The interesting application is that of Section 109, which is a critical doctrine for libraries because it enables the lending of legitimately acquired books. However, Hansen and Courtney (2018) pointed out that,

A critical limitation in the text of Section 109 is that it only allows the ‘owner of a copy’ to ‘sell or otherwise dispose’ of that particular copy. With distribution of physical copies, such as lending a print book to a library user, that framework works well enough. But to date, courts and legal scholars have struggled to identify what is a ‘particular’ copy in the digital realm. (pp. 7-8)

They continued by saying that while “we wait for the courts to sort out this statutory interpretation issue [what is a digital copy], libraries that seek to utilize CDL should still be able to apply the first sale doctrine’s rationale in the fair use context” (p. 8).

The CDL position statement applies Exhaustion [first sale] and Fair Use to CDL, with a summary of that analysis below:

- **Purpose and Character of the Use**: library lending focuses on socially beneficial outcomes; CDL provides non-discriminatory access and informational self-sufficiency to those unable to or having difficulty getting to a library; CDL fulfils the promise of the exhaustion doctrine, enabling libraries to distribute copies they own in a different format; not transformative, but overall the noncommercial and socially beneficial purposes of CDL favor fair use.

- **Nature of the Copyrighted Work**: published works; a stronger case for academic, informational, or nonfiction works; an even stronger case for commercially inactive, out-of-print or orphan works; all of which favor fair use.

- **Amount and Substantiality of the Portion Used**: providing temporary access to an entire digital work is reasonable and comparable to libraries lending the entire physical copy of a book for a specified time period.

- **Market Effect**: library copies have already been legitimately acquired, which means rights holders have already been compensated; libraries must maintain an *owned to loaned* ratio, comparable to physical lending. (Bailey, Courtney, Hansen, Minow, Schultz, & Wu, 2018, p. 3)

For a detailed analysis of the legal arguments regarding CDL, read Hansen’s and Courtney’s (2018) white paper (pp. 9-32). Also, note that they limit the “analysis to noncommercial, controlled, digital lending by U.S. libraries of digitized copies of print books held in their collections” (p. 8); and they believe that “the first factor, ‘purpose and character of the use,’ and the fourth factor ‘effect on the potential market’ are the most significant” factors to consider in a CDL Fair Use analysis (p. 11).

Since the initial release of the CDL position statement and white paper, the decision on an appeal of a court case, *Capitol Records, LLC v. ReDigi Inc.*, has cast a potential shadow on these arguments. Michelle Wu (2019) described the ReDigi model:

ReDigi is a service that facilitates resale of digital music. When a user wishes to sell music he purchased from iTunes, he can use ReDigi’s Music Manager and Cloud Locker to facilitate the sale. Music Manager verifies the legitimacy of the file to be resold, prevents the seller from retaining a copy of the work on any Music-Manager-connected-device after resale, and effectuates the transfer of the music file from the seller’s computer to the Cloud Locker. The Cloud Locker serves two functions, as a repository for the work and as the location from which a seller or buyer could download the item. If the seller downloads the item, it is made unavailable for sale. (para. 11)

Wu (2019) continued by saying,

ReDigi claimed that first sale and fair use protected its actions, and again both courts disagreed. As first sale protects only distribution and not reproduction, it was inapplicable in this case as soon as the court determined that a reproduction (an exclusive right of the copyright holder) had occurred.
In the analysis of ReDigi’s actions in the light of fair use claims, the courts determined that the actions were (1) non-transformative, (2) commercial, and (3) designed to take the place of copyright owner’s sales in the marketplace. For all those reasons, fair use did not apply. (para. 13)

In spite of this court decision, several library copyright experts (Jonathan Band (2018), Kevin Smith (2019), and Michelle Wu (2019)) believe there are enough differences between the ReDigi model and CDL that the decision is worthy of consideration but is not necessarily a deal breaker—particularly in light of a Fair Use analysis. Differences identified include:

- Commercial use vs. non-profit, educational use;
- Libraries legitimately own the copyrighted works;
- The most viable works for CDL are older, inactive, out-of-print, orphaned, not-digitally-available, etc.
- Perhaps a stronger transformative argument in that “a use can be transformative when it ‘utilizes technology to achieve the transformative purpose of improving delivery of content without unreasonably encroaching on the commercial entitlements of the rights holder,’” which is fundamentally at the heart of CDL (Smith, 2019);
- The digital copies are controlled with DRM by the lending library, ensuring that the work is accessible to only one user at a time (own to loan ratio) for a defined period.

However, they also tend to agree that the first sale/exhaustion doctrine may be more difficult to apply, given this decision. Band (2018) recommends that libraries consider the implementation of CDL only from a Fair Use perspective. Smith (2019) posits that from a policy perspective, Congress really needs to address the issue of digital first sale, stating that “the radical distinction between reproduction and distribution is both technologically outdated and leads to outcomes that are contrary to sound policy.”

From the library, end user, and “greater good” perspective, the benefits of CDL are quite clear:

- Increased discovery of and access to books that are potentially under-utilized;
- Relief for overcrowded shelves for libraries that replace older, out-of-print, little-used books with digital copies;
- Increased accessibility to books from the early to late 20th century to those with disabilities; in rural areas; with low incomes; who are elderly; from the born-digital generation, etc.
- A more convenient and efficient delivery of library materials;
- Circulation of rare, precious, unique books, while preserving the print copies;
- Potential to develop/revitalize the market for the works of under-discovered creators.

However, these benefits don’t come without costs, including: staff time needed to monitor usage and/or place the physical books in closed stacks; technological expertise needed to digitize books and provide files in an appropriate DRM environment; funds to support the cost of digitization, whether done in-house or outsourced; and the long-term storage and preservation of the digital works.

Not surprisingly, there are those who strongly object to CDL—primarily the rights holders or those who represent rights holders, many identified here: [https://nppa.org/sites/default/files/CDL-Appeal-13FEB2019-v1.pdf](https://nppa.org/sites/default/files/CDL-Appeal-13FEB2019-v1.pdf). Their concerns are many and include:

- Blatant copyright infringement because of unauthorized copying, distribution, and display of works;
- Neither the first sale doctrine nor the fair use exception applies;
- Not permitted under the Berne Convention on Copyright, of which the U.S. is a signatory;
- U.S. copyright law does not apply to works published in other countries;
The rights holders are uncompensated for the creation of multiple digital copies, potentially depriving them of their livelihood;

- Competes with legitimate e-book licenses;
- Lending a digital book is not analogous to lending a print book (first sale/exhaustion doctrine);
- The orphan works issue is minimal because rights holders can be located;
- Physical books wear out, requiring replacement; digital copies never wear out, thereby impacting the marketplace;
- “Copies” of works remain in the computer/browser cache, even after returned.

Consider these concerns in light of the 6 guiding principles provided in the CDL position paper to which libraries should adhere:

1. Ensure that original works are acquired lawfully;
2. Apply CDL only to works that are owned and not licensed;
3. Limit the total number of copies in any format in circulation at any time to the number of physical copies the library lawfully owns (maintain an ‘owned to loaned’ ratio);
4. Lend each digital version only to a single user at a time just as a physical copy would be loaned;
5. Limit the time period for each lend to one that is analogous to physical lending; and
6. Use digital rights management to prevent copying and redistribution. (Bailey et al., 2018, p. 3)

Although these 6 principles don’t address all the concerns, they do address some of them. For example, applying CDL only to works that are owned and not licensed immediately precludes the potential practice of digitizing a book and making it available when it’s already available as an e-book that can be licensed; and using DRM (the same DRM currently used by e-book distributors) to prevent copying and further distribution.

Hansen & Courtney (2018) provided recommendations to mitigate risk associated with CDL that also addresses the fears of rights holders:

- Introduce additional friction into the system by extending the time period between loans of digital copies;
- Place lending limits on digital copies that mimic the degradation of a physical book (e.g., 2,000 loans before it degrades);
- Diligently and immediately secure print copies in closed stacks or only enable digital lending for materials already in closed stacks;
- Limit or don’t provide options for making copies of pages;
- Use a takedown policy, giving rights holders the option to communicate with the library;
- Select books that may be in the public domain:
  - Older works first published in the U.S.;
  - Works published before 1989, since these works had to comply with U.S. copyright notice requirements;
  - Works published before 1963, since these works must have been renewed with the U.S. Copyright Office to have continued protection and very few filed for renewal;
- Select books in their last 20 years of copyright protection (published between 1924 and 1944), for which the library is willing to perform due diligence to determine if the works are still commercially available (Section 108 (h));
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- Select books that are:
  - Out of print;
  - Off the market – i.e., orphan works, works protected by copyright but for which a user cannot, after a diligent search, identify the copyright holder;
  - Non-fiction or primarily factual;
  - Filled with significant quantities of U.S. government-authored content (pp. 32-42)

Last, a discussion of CDL needs to include the Internet Archive Open Library (https://openlibrary.org), which began in 2010 and enables anyone who creates an account to borrow digital versions of books using the CDL model. At the time of the launch, Open Library had more than 1 million digital versions of older books, along with 70,000 current digital books available to those with a library card from many of the 11,000+ libraries that subscribed to OverDrive (Internet Archive Blogs, 2010, Jun 28). Since then, the Open Library has grown substantially, as is shown in Brewster Khale’s (2017) statement: “The Internet Archive has digitized more than 2.5 million public domain (pre-1923) books and made them fully downloadable and 500,000+ modern (post-1923) books and made them available to the blind and dyslexic and through its lending system on its Open Library site.”

How has the Internet Archive achieved this level of growth? In part through partnerships with libraries:

After signing on to the program, libraries share their catalogs with Internet Archive and our engineers perform an overlap analysis to determine the physical books in a library’s collection that match the books we have digitized. Where there’s a match, the Internet Archive returns links and catalog records to the digital book so that the library can include these in their catalog. (Freeland, 2019, Jun 3)

The Internet Archive also works with libraries to digitize books in their collections, add them to the Open Library, and “circulate” them under a controlled digital lending model, with details outlined in their library participation agreement (https://goo.gl/forms/Usood7a9AP7kadjl2). To this end, they have 272 partner libraries (http://openlibraries.library.illinois.edu/preservation/) and 1,492 contributing libraries (http://openlibraries.library.illinois.edu/libraries/). These partnerships provide one solution for libraries that have identified print books they want digitally accessible but don’t have the resources to do on their own. In their library systems, they can create links to digital content accessible from the Open Library that corresponds to their print inventory. To comply with CDL, they do need to remove the physical books from the shelves to maintain the “own to loan” ratio, but they won’t have to digitize, house, and manage access to the digital works. If libraries have unique content to contribute to the Open Library, they can contract with Internet Archive for that digitization, making those works available in the Open Library, not only to their constituents, but also to other libraries that demonstrate their ownership of the books.

Returning to CDL, the Open Library publicly displays the loan limitation function in practice by looking at their copy of the book Wasted (https://tinyurl.com/yyfdcvd4) by Mark Judge—a book that came to light during the Brett Kavanaugh hearings. The hearings significantly increased interest in this book, but it’s out of print, and although available from Amazon, the cost ranges from $78.50 to $337.27 (https://tinyurl.com/y3zfrpo9)! As seen from the screenshot below, the book is also available from Open Library—with 413 people waiting for it. Despite the demand for this out-of-print book, the Open Library maintains control over its accessibility.

![Screenshot from openlibrary.org on 8.2.2019](https://example.com/screenshot.png)
The future of Controlled Digital Lending is still up for debate and possibly won’t be resolved until (1) a policy on first sale/exhaustion for digital works is determined and (2) one or more lawsuits start to move through the court system. The problem with these options is time. Given the current state of Congress, when will they decide it’s time to address this issue and what will that policy look like, given the potential influence from lobbyists representing rights holders? Regarding lawsuits—look at the Georgia State University lawsuit which has been going on for more than 10 years and still has no final resolution. Major copyright litigation requires a tremendous amount of finances and commitment over a long period of time—a road few want to travel. In the meantime, we live in an ever-increasing digital world, but according to an EveryLibrary (2019) blog post “only a fraction of the estimated 150 million titles in the world have been digitized”—this is a problem.

Contrary to the detractors’ perspectives, Controlled Digital Lending is not intended to serve as a rationale for the wholesale digitization of all print books to the financial detriment of rights holders. To the contrary, both the CDL position statement and white paper lay out clear guidelines and parameters for how CDL can be reasonably applied using existing copyright law. Libraries wanting to pursue CDL need to codify their purposes for digitizing print materials—identifying exactly what needs to be digitized and for what purpose—going beyond a simple desire to format shift and lend. Each library needs to perform its own Fair Use analysis—as it applies to their identified outcomes—working with appropriate legal counsel to determine if CDL is the best decision for them. The CDL road lies ahead for those who choose to travel it wisely.

Additional Resources
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Have you created an instruction program or developed a unique classroom strategy? Please share your experiences with LIRT!

Send your articles to Sherri Brown

slb4kt@virginia.edu
Get Involved with LIRT

LIRT Standing Committees

Use the online form to volunteer

Adult Learners
This committee is charged with assisting library professionals to more effectively serve adult learners.

Awards
This committee is charged with selecting the recipients for the LIRT Innovation in Instruction Award and the LIRT Librarian Recognition Award.

Communications
This committee is responsible for soliciting and distributing content, in both written and visual formats, for all avenues of communication with LIRT membership. This includes, but is not limited to, preparing and distributing the round table’s newsletter, curating all social media accounts, and providing oversight of LIRT’s online presence. The committee may create and update content, as well as solicit content and advise other committees regarding the creation and maintenance of content.

Conference Program
This committee shall be responsible for annual program preparation and presentation.

Liaison
This committee shall initiate and maintain communication with groups within the American Library Association dealing with issues relevant to library instruction and shall disseminate information about these groups’ activities.

Membership
This committee shall be responsible for publicizing the Round Table’s purposes, activities and image; and for promoting membership in the Round Table.

Organization and Planning
This committee shall be responsible for long-range planning and making recommendations to guide the future direction of LIRT.

Teaching, Learning, & Technology
This committee will be responsible for identifying and promoting the use of technology in library instruction. Special attention will be given to technologies that enhance learning and can be easily adapted to a variety of different learning environments. Activities will include assisting with programs, writing reviews and articles for the newsletter, and promoting research that relates to our charge.

Top 20
This committee shall be responsible for monitoring the library instruction literature and identifying high quality library-instruction related articles from all types of libraries. Annually, this committee shall prepare and publish in the LIRT News a list of the Top 20 articles on library instruction.

Transitions to College
This committee builds and supports partnerships between school, public, and academic librarians to assist students in

For more information about our committees, visit: http://www.ala.org/lirt/committees